



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,759	10/17/2003	Santosh R. D'Mello	UTDA:1141	1987
34725 7590 CHALKER FLORES, LLP 2711 LBJ FRWY Suite 1036 DALLAS, TX 75234			EXAMINER CRUZ, KATHLEEN ANN	
			ART UNIT 1628	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/24/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/688,759

Applicant(s)

D'MELLO ET AL.

Examiner

KATHRIEN CRUZ

Art Unit

1628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-11, 13 and 16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12 and 14-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-34 are pending.

Claims 1-11, 13 and 16 are withdrawn.

Claims 12, 14, 15, 17-34 are examined herewith.

Applicants response filed August 28, 2009 has been received and entered into the application.

Priority

This application claims benefit to provisional application 60/419,439 (dated 10/18/2002) and provisional application 60/440,177 (dated 01/15/2003).

Action Summary

Claims 12, 14-15 and 17-19 and 22-27 rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is withdrawn. However, claims 12, 20 and 21 rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is withdrawn.

Claims 28-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is withdrawn.

Claim 12, 14, 22-23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.112, first paragraph, because the specification , while being enabling for making and using salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonable provide enablement for making and using prodrugs, derivatives, complex, solvates or hydrates of the claimed compounds is withdrawn. **However, claims 17-18, 20, 24 and 26 is maintained.**

Claims 12, 14, 18-22, 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweatt et al (U.S.Publication 2002/0058699) and Hall-Jackson et al (Paradoxical activation of Raf by a novel Raf inhibitor, Chemistry & Biology, August 1999, 6:559-568) is maintained. Additionally, claims 29-34 are included in the rejection as cited above.

Response to Arguments

Applicants argue that epilepsy does not directly cause neuronal loss. This argument has been fully considered but has not been found persuasive. **As evidence only**, Roux (p75 Neurotrophin Receptor Expression is induced in Apoptotic Neurons after Seizure, Journal of Neuroscience, August 15, 1999, 19(16); pages 6887-6896) expressly teaches in the abstract that seizures causes neuronal cell loss in both animal model and human epilepsy. And that determination of the contribution of apoptotic mechanism to seizure-induced neuronal cell death. Therefore, seizures do in fact cause neuronal cell loss as demonstrated by Roux.

Applicants argue that Sweatt does not teach neurodegenerative disorder. This argument has been fully considered but has not been found persuasive. Sweatt teaches that seizures can occur in a variety of situations including epilepsy, Parkinson's disease (which is a neurodegenerative disease), trauma, drug addition and cerebral palsy (paragraph 0003). Therefore, Sweatt does teach that seizures may occur in patients with neurodegenerative disease (e.g. Parkinson's disease), or trauma.

Applicants argue that Hall-Jackson does not address the issue of neurological or neurodegenerative diseases. This argument has been fully considered but has not been found persuasive. Swatt teaches that seizures can occur in a variety of situations including epilepsy, Parkinson's disease (which is a neurodegenerative disease), trauma, drug addition and cerebral palsy. Sweatt teaches that the amount of activated MAPK in a neuron can be reduced by approaches that cause dephosphorylation of upstream kinases in the MAPK cascade. Thus, compounds that activate phosphatases specific for any members of the MAPK cascade upstream of MAPK will reduce the activity of the upstream kinase, ultimately leading to reduced downstream activity of MAPK. Compounds that effect dephosphorylation of other upstream kinases including Ras, Raf1 (also known as c-raf), B-Raf and Rap1 may be used And Hall-Jackson teaches that N-[5-(3- Dimethylaminobenzamide)-2-methylphenyl]-4-hydroxybenzamide (herein after, "ZM 336372") is a potent and specific inhibitor of c-Raf that shows a tenfold selectivity over B-Raf. Therefore, with the combined prior art would lead one of ordinary skills in the art that Parkinson's disease as well as subjects with trauma would benefit from the administration of C-Rafs.

Applicants argue that Varga references does not refer to any neurological or neurodegenerative disease. This argument has been fully considered but has not been found persuasive. Swatt teaches that seizures can occur in a variety of situations including epilepsy, Parkinson's disease (which is a neurodegenerative disease), trauma, drug addition and cerebral palsy. Additionally, everyone is susceptible to any neurodegenerative diseases and therefore everyone would benefit from the

administration of C-Raf (e.g. GW 5074). Furthermore, in response to applicants arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

For the ease of the applicant, the previous office action dated May 5, 2009 is reproduced below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 12, 14, 18-22, 24-27 and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweatt et al (U.S.Publication 2002/0058699) and Hall-Jackson et al (Paradoxical activation of Raf by a novel Raf inhibitor, Chemistry & Biology, August 1999, 6:559-568) both are of record.

Sweatt teaches that the amount of activated MAPK in a neuron can be reduced by approaches that cause dephosphorylation of upstream kinases in the MAPK cascade. Thus, compounds that activate phosphatases specific for any members of the MAPK cascade upstream of MAPK will reduce the activity of the upstream kinase, ultimately leading to reduced downstream activity of MAPK. Compounds that effect dephosphorylation of other upstream kinases including Ras, Raf1 (also known as c-raf), B-Raf and Rap1 may be used (paragraph 0027). Sweatt teaches that compounds that inhibit the activity of kinases upstream of MAPK in the MAPK cascade include c-

Raf (paragraph 0032). Sweatt teaches that such compounds (e.g. c-Raf's) may be administered to humans and mammals (paragraph 0036). Sweatt teaches that c-raf may be used in the treatment of seizure disorders (abstract).

Sweatt does not expressly teach the c-Raf of N-[5-(3-Dimethylaminobenzamide)-2-methylphenyl]-4-hydroxybenzamide

Hall-Jackson teaches that N-[5-(3-Dimethylaminobenzamide)-2-methylphenyl]-4-hydroxybenzamide (herein after, "ZM 336372") is a potent and specific inhibitor of c-Raf that shows a tenfold selectivity over B-Raf (page 565, first paragraph under Discussion). Hall-Jackson teaches that cells (in mammals) have a feedback loop by which Raf suppresses its own activation, so that any inhibition of Raf is rapidly counterbalanced by its reactivation. This implies that cells does contain high specific activity c-Raf that is inhibited from activating its downstream substrate MKK1 because of the presence of the inhibitor (page 565, first paragraph under Discussion). Hall-Jackson teaches that ZM 336372 inhibits c-Raf and B-Raf (page 566, table 4 and first paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ the specific c-Raf, ZM 336372 to treat epilepsy (seizure disorder) or individuals susceptible to neurodegenerative disease. One would have been motivated to employ ZM 336372 because ZM 336372 is a potent and effective inhibitor of c-raf and B-raf as taught by Hall-Jackson.

Examiner further points out that any individual is susceptible to neurodegenerative disease as the individual ages and would benefit by the administration of c-Raf inhibitors.

With regards to the c-raf inhibitor (e.g. ZM 336372) inhibiting neuronal cell death via B-raf regulation, it is a property of the c-Raf that upon administration of a c-Raf to a mammal that inhibition of cell death via B-raf regulation would be obtained. Furthermore, presence of a property not possessed by the prior art is evidence of nonobviousness. *In re Papesch*, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963) (rejection of claims to compound structurally similar to the prior art compound was reversed because claimed compound unexpectedly possessed anti-inflammatory properties not possessed by the prior art compound); *Ex parte Thumm*, 132 USPQ 66 (Bd. App. 1961) (Appellant showed that the claimed range of ethylene diamine was effective for the purpose of producing "regenerated cellulose consisting substantially entirely of skin" whereas the prior art warned "this compound has practically no effect."). The submission of evidence that a new product possesses unexpected properties does not necessarily require a conclusion that the claimed invention is nonobvious. *In re Payne*, 606 F.2d 303, 203 USPQ 245 (CCPA 1979). See the discussion of latent properties and additional advantages in MPEP § 2145.

Claims 15, 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweatt et al (U.S.Publication 2002/0058699) and Hall-Jackson et al (Paradoxical activation of Raf by a novel Raf inhibitor, Chemistry & Biology, August

1999, 6:559-568) as applied to claims 12, 14, 18-22, 24-27 above, and further in view of Varga (Involvement of Raf-1 in chronic ζ -opioid receptor agonist-mediated adenylyl cyclase superactivation, European Journal of Pharmacology 451, 2002, 101-102) all are of record.

Neither Sweatt nor Hall-Jackson expressly teach {5-iodo-3- [(3, 5-dibromo-4-hydroxyphenyl) methylene]-2-indolinone} (herein after GW 5074).

Varga teaches that GW 5074 is a c-Raf inhibitor.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to employ the specific c-Raf of GW 5074 for the treatment of individuals susceptible to neurodegenerative diseases. One would be motivated to employ GW 5074 because GW 5074 is a c-Raf inhibitor as taught by Varga and **everyone is susceptible for neurodegenerative disease and would benefit from the administration of GW 5074**. Therefore, the claim limitations as set forth in claims 15, 17 and 23 have been met.

For these reasons, the claimed subject matter is deemed to fail to be patentably distinguishable over the state of the art as represented by the cited reference. The claims are therefore, properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103. In light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a).

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention.

Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

Claims 12, 14, 15, 17-34 are rejected.

No claims are allowed.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KATHRIEN CRUZ whose telephone number is (571)270-5238. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 7:00am - 5:00pm with every Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brandon Fetterolf can be reached on (571) 272-2919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/KATHRIEN CRUZ/
Examiner, Art Unit 1628

/San-ming Hui/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1628